RATING SYSTEM OVERVIEW
School Turnaround AmeriCorps FY13 Grant Competition
Corporation for National and Community Service

I. Introduction

Grants will be awarded on a competitive basis. Reviewers will assess the application based on the Selection Criteria published in the *Notice*: [1]Program Design, [2]Organizational Capability, and [3]Cost Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy. Program Design will be assessed with a particular focus on evidence of effectiveness for the proposed solution(s) to support and sustain school turnaround efforts, appropriateness of national service as a solution, and potential quality of the member experience. Reviewers will consider Organizational Capability and Cost Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy to assess the comprehensiveness and feasibility of the application based on the Selection Criteria.

II. Selection Criteria Point Value

The chart below details the point values allocated to each criterion.

SELECTION CRITERIA	SECTION POINTS	POINTS by Criterion
PROGRAM DESIGN	**50**	
AmeriCorps Members as Highly Effective Means to Support and Sustain School Turnaround Efforts		15
Evidence-Informed and Measurable Impact		15
AmeriCorps Member Recruitment		5
AmeriCorps Member Training		5
AmeriCorps Member Supervision		5
AmeriCorps Member Experience		3
Organizational Commitment to AmeriCorps Identification		2
ORGANIZATIONAL CAPABILITY	**25**	
Organizational Background and Staffing		8
Sustainability		5
Compliance and Accountability		9
Continuous Improvement		3
COST EFFECTIVENESS AND BUDGET ADEQUACY	**25**	
Cost Effectiveness		13
Budget Adequacy		12

III. Scoring Rubric and Rating Description

CNCS will orient Reviewers on how to evaluate and rate the information in each application. This will include guidance consistent with the requirements, priorities, and Selection Criteria outlined in the *Notice*. Reviewers will rate applications based on the extent to which the applicant addresses the criteria and the quality of the response.

The Reviewers will use the following values for each Assessment Rating. These values will subsequently be weighted to calculate the appropriate score for the respective Points by Criterion.

Assessment Ratings				
Excellent	**Above Average**	**Average**	**Below Average**	**Poor**
10 points	8 points	6 points	4 points	2 points

Reviewers will consider the description for each Rating in their assessment of the Selection Criteria.

Excellent:

- High-quality response, addressing all elements of the criteria and exceeding requirements in almost all instances.
- Identified strengths are substantial and solid.
- No weaknesses identified, or an identified weakness has a minimal effect on the overall quality of this response.
- Provides a complete and highly compelling narrative of how the criteria are reflected in the proposed program and design, and how it will be actualized.

Above Average:

- Quality response, addressing all elements of the criteria and exceeding requirements in some instances.
- Identified strengths are substantial.
- Identified weaknesses are minimal in quantity and effect on the overall quality of this response.
- Provides a realistic narrative of how the criteria are reflected in the proposed program and design, and how it will be actualized.

Average:

- Acceptable response that addresses most elements of the selection criteria.
- Strengths and weaknesses identified that may balance each other in significance.
- Provides a narrative that explains, with room for improvement, how the criteria are reflected in the proposed program and design, and how it will be actualized.

Below Average:

- Low-quality response, addressing some of the elements of the criteria and neglecting to meet the requirements in more than one instance.
- Several weaknesses identified. Identified weaknesses held a greater weight than the identified strengths.
- Provides a narrative that lacks specificity and leaves room for assumptions on how the criteria are reflected in the proposed program and design, and how it will be actualized.

Poor:

- Very low quality response, neglecting to address many of the elements of the criteria and failing to meet the requirements in many instances.
- Many weaknesses identified. Identified weaknesses held a significant weight, overshadowing the identified strengths.
- There is minimal and/or no explanation how the criteria are reflected in the proposed program and design, and how it will be actualized. Description is inadequate, with significant flaws in key elements.